



Master Plan Implementation Committee

Date: March 9, 2021

Time: 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Location: Conducted via Remote Participation

Minutes

Present: Joe Barr, Peter Howard, Ann LeRoyer, Charlie Kalauskas, Jenny Raitt, Ralph Willmer, Erin Zwirko.

Absent: Mike Byrne, Adam Chapdelaine, Wendy Richter.

Erin kicked off the meeting by reading the rules for remote participation. Erin acknowledged that it has been a very long time since the MPIC has met. She stated that the staff wanted to reconvene to review the 2021 Annual Town Meeting warrant articles and to review the activities that were ongoing during 2020. She also noted that she would like to schedule an upcoming meeting to review a Report to Town Meeting from this Committee.

The first item on the agenda was to review relevant zoning articles submitted to Annual Town Meeting. Erin noted that the ARB is currently holding meetings on March 1, March 15, March 29, and April 5. The ARB will vote on April 5. On the articles, Erin presented the ones that are relevant to the Master Plan.

On the Industrial District amendments, Erin noted that this project started in late 2019 with the Zoning Bylaw Working Group and has continued through the past year. The amendment is intended to update and modernize the industrial districts. There is an incentive built into the amendment to give a greater height to ground floor industrial or commercial uses that may need an over height first floor in exchange for sustainability and stormwater measures due to many of the industrial districts being located partially within the Mill Brook floodplain. The discussion on residential being allowed in mixed-use projects will probably draw the most debate. Erin noted that the consultants provided a pro forma analysis of the zoning requirements and recommended that if the zoning changes were to be successful, residential uses would create the financial incentive to redevelop property.

The Committee discussed a number of items relative to this amendment. Affordable housing requirements in Section 8.2 are still applicable. The new legislation allowing a simple majority vote at Town Meeting would not be applicable, although the special permits issued may only need a simply majority if residential uses are included. The

amount of residential allowed within mixed-use projects was discussed. The Master Plan refers to 50%, and the Committee discussed how to address this topic at Town Meeting. The recommendation looks different from the Master Plan based on the additional work that RKG completed as part of the project. The project is also relevant to the sustainability of the districts in terms of economic development and the adjacent resources.

Moving on to an amendment that was deferred from the 2020 Annual Town Meeting relative to mixed-uses, the Committee discussed how mixed-use is applied in the community. The Committee discussed whether they would want to weigh in on this item to be supportive for the ARB's authority. It was noted that the clause proposed is not used in other communities.

The MPIC turned to the amendment for accessory dwelling units. Erin provided an overview of what the article would likely include, and that it would be consistent with the revisions to Chapter 40A which allow a lower voting threshold at Town Meeting. The Committee members discussed some of the particulars of the amendment including the owner occupancy, parking, and where an accessory dwelling unit could be created (only in single-family, two-family, and duplex structures in residential and business districts).

Erin noted that the requirement for MBTA Communities will be deferred by the ARB to a future Town Meeting due to eligibility for grant opportunities being preserved and wanting to review guidance from the State and take the time to create an amendment that meets the requirements of the law.

A Committee member asked about two of the parking-related amendments submitted by the Disability Commission via the Select Board. The Committee discussed how the HP parking requirement may be problematic to create additional or different standards, and the MAAB standards may be unnecessary.

The Committee then turned to the implementation plan. Erin and Jenny provided an overview of the work that was completed in 2020, and the upcoming projects for 2021, including those that were deferred until 2021. Erin noted that the Historic and Cultural Resources Working Group, a subcommittee, will be reengaged for historic and cultural related projects. The Committee discussed whether the Town would receive funding from the new stimulus package from the federal government. It is likely that funding will be in the form of the Community Development Block Grant. The Committee also discussed the capital projects that were identified in the Master Plan.

The Committee discussed other items related to the implementation plan including discussing future infrastructure improvement programs and projects with the DPW director and an analysis of time involved relative to staff work on master planning activities.

The next meeting will be held on April 2, 2021 at 2 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM.